UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Must Religion Be an Illusion?

(A Reply to Freud)

By WALTER WALSH

Across the Threshold

By DOREMUS SCUDDER

America—West to East

By SYDNEY STRONG

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part V—Chapter XXXVI

By M. K. GANDHI

VOLUME CIV NUMBER 3

Chicago, October 7, 1929

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JEREMIAH LA. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUTHERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 3, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

COMING

Three articles in successive issues

By

SHERWOOD EDDY

I. England and France

England and France are still living in the post-war era, and thus still struggling heroically with post-war problems. The way of the victor in modern warfare is hard.

II. Germany—and Einstein

"I, myself, am a pacifist, an absolute pacifist. We should foster peace by every possible means. We should even seek in time of peace to have men take a solemn pledge to take no destructive part in any future war."—*Einstein.*

III. Soviet Russia as Seen Today

Russia's purpose: "to make war impossible and to transform the whole world into a cooperative commonwealth, and bring about real human brotherhood." . . . "Whatever our benevolent intentions, to Russia our present policy means war."

Do not miss these issues. Send in your subscription now

$3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 35

Must Religion Be an Illusion?—WALTER WALSH 37

Jottings—J. H. H. 40

Editorial Correspondence: America—West to East—SYDNEY STRONG 41

ARTICLES—

"Materialistic Science Dead"—*Richard C. Cabot* 35

Across the Threshold—DOREMUS SCUDDER 43

The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part V, Chapter XXXVI—M. K. GANDHI .. 44

POETRY—

The Land that Men Call Free—ELENORE BLAKE 42

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Eternal Jewish Question—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 46

CORRESPONDENCE—

An Appeal from Our Editor—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 46

THE FIELD—

Chicago Announcements 47

The Ministry Stands Fast on Prohibition 47

Pan-American Arbitration Treaty 48

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1929 NUMBER 3

"MATERIALISTIC SCIENCE DEAD"

. . . "I think we are right at the crossroads of an epoch in science, and in living also, as significant, perhaps more significant, than that of Darwin's day. A group of scientific leaders, better educated and with better thinking powers than the older biologists are coming on. They are keeping science apart from theological implications and *vice versa.* Much of the science which people with a good degree of information are talking, is out of date. Students of the subject have known of the change for a number of years, but it has yet to sift into the common mind that materialistic science is dead and that a new interpretation, which says that the knowledge which deals with physical reality is only part of truth, is upon us. The notion that science abolishes purpose in the world is absurd and is the result of poor scientific thinking. Such scientists as Haeckel and his followers, who thought of the universe as a mechanism, haven't been left a leg to stand on." . . .

—*Dr. Richard C. Cabot,* in the *Christian Register.*

With this issue, UNITY returns to its regular schedule of weekly publication. We are glad, as we hope our readers are glad, for the summer has brought to our office a quite exceptional accumulation of material for our columns. Thus, we have letters from foreign correspondents on our staff, important contributions from travelers in England, Germany and Russia, and numerous articles on current topics and also on subjects of more general significance. The pages of UNITY should be of extraordinary interest during these next few months. We invite the best attention of our readers.

Some weeks ago the United States Senate passed a resolution calling for the publication of the income tax returns of the big business corporations asking for tariff increases in the bill now pending in the upper house. If there could be anything more sensible, more straight-to-the-point, than this, we do not at the moment know what it is. Now it happens that very active in the support of this resolution were the Senate Democrats, to their everlasting credit be it said. But, lo and behold, no sooner is the vote recorded and the tax returns thus called for, than there comes a howl, long, poignant and painful, from Mr. Raskob, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. This millionaire, it will be remembered, was the life-long Republican manager of General Motors, who became so enamored of Governor Smith in the last campaign that he jumped the party fence and took the happy job of paying the deficits in Democratic Committee's accounts. And now this ex-Republican denounces the Democratic senators for passing the income tax resolution, and thus alienating the goodwill of the great corporations of the country! Here I am, says Raskob, devoting my life, and emptying my pocket-book, to the end of rehabilitating the Democratic Party. For months I have been wooing the big business interests of the country, showing them that the Democratic Party is just as friendly to them as the Republican Party, and pledging them support in their labors for prosperity. And here, at just the critical moment, when I was making some progress with these billion-dollar concerns, these senators in Washington spill all the beans! Yes, yes—and incidentally also, dear Mr. Raskob, thanks to your own silly blubberings about the matter, give the whole show away! Now we have proof for what we have already amply suspected, that the Democratic Party has no ambition other than that of being a twin-brother of the Republican Party, and thus sharing a bit more generously in the swag of politics. We hope Mr. Raskob will not be discouraged. On the contrary, we hope he will keep right on in his good work, and make a complete job of it at least by annexing the Democrats to the Republicans.

We feel certain that we ought to say something in these columns about Shearer and the three shipbuilding companies, and the propaganda work that wrecked the naval reduction conference in Geneva a year ago. President Hoover got justly and magnificently mad over the disclosures, and the Senate in a noble outburst of indignation ordered the investigation which is now so sensationally proceeding. The whole affair is "nuts" for small-navy men, disarmament advocates, pacifists and other reprehensibles, of which we are incorrigibly one. We ought to be crowing these days like a rooster on a dung-heap. But somehow or other we can not seem to find anything to say, nor the spirit of fine frenzy in which to say it. For why get excited over war propaganda at this late date? Are we fools that we do not know that this sort of thing is going on all of the time, in peace times exactly as in war times? Have we no memories, that we do not recall past exposés of conspiracies on the part of shipbuilders and ammunition manufacturers with one another and against the government on behalf of preparedness and war? It is on the record that companies inter-

ested in the production of war materials in one country have actually cooperated with similar companies in another country to stir up trouble between their respective countries, and thus boom business. There are profits in patriotism, and patriots can be counted upon to foster these profits. This Shearer scandal is such "old stuff" that we have found it boresome even to read the details of a story we have read so many times before. Some time governments, thus betrayed, are going to build their own battleships and manufacture their own guns and bullets, if they have to indulge in such instruments of death. Meanwhile, if we are to wax wroth, we propose to visit our indignation not upon Shearer, who was earning his salary, nor upon the ship-builders, who were protecting their interests (just like the tariff-mongers now in Washington!), but upon our great and virtuous newspapers who lapped up this propaganda stuff last year as cats lap milk.

There is one aspect of the Shearer scandal, however, which is of vast importance. It is this, we imagine, which moved the President to speak out with such amazing frankness and thus get the matter dramatically before the country's attention. It was not that he was so much surprised or excited over what had been done by this propaganda specialist at the last disarmament conference, as that he saw an opportunity of preventing Shearer and his ilk from doing anything of the kind at the next disarmament conference. Thanks to Mr. Hoover, this sleepy nation is now wide awake on the question of selfish propaganda for big armies and navies, and will tolerate no "funny business" in the immediate future. The newspapers, also, may be trusted, for a while at least, to know where their material on armaments is coming from. All of which is auspicious for the five-power conference announced by President Hoover and Premier MacDonald for the new year! Never has the situation been so promising for the reduction of arms as it is at this moment. After months of delicate but determined deliberation, Great Britain and America seem to be agreed upon a program. If this be true, as Mr. MacDonald's visit to this country would seem to indicate beyond any doubt, then the key is in the lock, and will soon be turned. For what Great Britian and the United States agree upon must straightway clear the road for action upon the part of all the great powers, as regards navies at least. There can be no resisting the joint leadership of these two nations. Not even Mussolini would dare to hold out against them. So, for the first time in the life of this generation, there seems impending real action in getting rid of the burden and menace of competitive armaments. The Hague Conferences failed; the much-tooted Washington Conference was a ghastly and dishonest joke; the League of Nations has been able to do nothing. But now, by a happy conjunction of circumstances, come two men who really mean business, who have brains and courage, and who are in positions of supreme potential power in their respective countries. And victory is in sight! We dare for the moment to be optimistic on this most discouraging of all questions of peace and war.

Obviously there is some powerful force behind this silly and dangerous exhibition of Boston tyranny. When Mayor, District Attorney, Police Chief, judges and other officers all join in this pernicious idiocy, some strong body or element is pulling the strings. What is this secret influence in Boston?

This is the comment of the New York *World* on the censorship situation in Boston, as indicated by the crowning "idiocy" of banning Eugene O'Neill's "Strange Interlude," a Pulitzer Prize play and one of the great dramas of the contemporary world, from this immaculate home of the modern Puritans. It points straight to what is so sinister a fact in our strange society—namely, the secret forces behind the silly and wicked things that are being done among us all of the time. Nothing is open and above-board any longer. Hidden away from the sight and knowledge of men are the factors of influence which fashion public opinion, dictate the processes of government, make and unmake the destinies of nations. Now and again something happens to lift the lid, and we catch a glimpse of what is going on beneath. Thus, a year or so ago, we discovered what the power companies were doing in the way of buying and controlling newspapers, hiring lecturers and writers, and in other ways poisoning the wells of public knowledge. Just now, through the Shearer scandal, we are learning how the armament manufacturers break down disarmament conferences, write big navy bills, and in general foment war and discourage peace. In Washington today, if we could get behind the scenes, we would see the protected business interests of the nation dictating the terms of the new tariff bill which is to take more money out of all our pockets. And in Boston, of course, there is a private influence pulling the strings of puppet mayors and police chiefs in this censorship matter. The invisible government that surrounds us is the most potent force in American life today. And we have not the courage nor the sense to get rid of it!

The mention of secret influences in public life brings immediately to mind the Mooney case. Who, or what, is keeping Tom Mooney in jail? If anyone doubts that some hidden and sinister power is at work, we invite such a person to secure a copy of the new pamphlet just issued by the Tom Mooney Defense Committee (P. O. Box 1475M, San Francisco) under the title, "Pardon Tom Mooney—He Is Innocent." This pamphlet is altogether one of the most impressive documents we have ever seen. On the cover are pic-

tures of Mooney as he appeared in 1916 and 1929, showing vividly and tragically what a dozen years in prison can do to a man. Inside is a wealth of material proving Mooney's innocence of the crime for which he was convicted, and of the complete break-down of the case against him. Here, for example, is the famous photograph showing Mooney and his wife on a housetop a mile and a quarter from the scene of the explosion which they were accused of causing by a bomb, and a clock dial on the street below marking the time of 2:01 P. M., five minutes before the explosion took place. Here also is copy of a page from the register of Byrns Hotel, Woodland, California, showing the signature of F. C. Oxman, star witness against Mooney, under date of Saturday, July 22, 1916, the day he claimed to be in San Francisco, ninety miles away, together with the affidavit of the hotel proprietor, Hatch, that Oxman was in Woodland at the exact hour of the bomb throwing. In addition to abundant material of this sort, the pamphlet contains an eloquent array of letters and appeals calling for Mooney's release. Thus Judge Griffin, who tried the case and sentenced Mooney, now declares him "innocent", describes his conviction as "one of the dirtiest jobs ever put over," and demands his pardon. James F. Brennan, one of the attorneys who prosecuted the case, recommends that "pardon should be granted." The captain of detectives, Duncan Matheson, who gathered the evidence, states that he is now "convinced beyond any question of doubt that your (Mooney's) rights were violated," and calls for "executive clemency." All the living jurors in the case, in letters here printed, favor Mooney's pardon. Yet the case has been lying in the office of California governors for five years, and nothing has been done. What influences, unknown to the public, have controlled these executives? What is preventing Gov. Young, day after day, month after month, from granting the petition for pardon now before him? Turn on the lights! Let's see what's going on!

The mobbing, looting, kidnaping, and murder incident to the strike at Gastonia, N. C., constitute an amazing phenomenon. It is difficult to associate such riotous goings-on with North Carolina, which has in recent years developed in many ways as the most progressive and enlightened of all the southern states. North Carolina has good roads, modern cities, some excellent newspapers, a high-class judiciary (witness Judge Barnhill!), fine schools and colleges, and a University which now ranks among the half-dozen best state universities in this country. There are survivals in North Carolina of the old regime. The unreconstructed South meets one, for example, in the brutal chain-gangs on the public highways. But on the whole the state is modern, ambitious, civilized. Yet it is in this state, in connection with a casual strike of mill-hands, that violence has suddenly broken out in forms which remind one of the recent horrors in Palestine. Of course, the presence of outside Communist agitators, as fomenters and leaders of the strike, explains much of the ferocity, which has its roots in fear. But beyond this is the ironical fact that it is just because North Carolina is so progressive that her citizens are acting in this way. What we mean is that North Carolina, first among all the southern states, is becoming industrialized. She is now in that peculiarly unstable stage of evolution from agriculture to industry, through which most of the northern states have long since passed. The new industry has brought to North Carolina its usual civilizing influences, but also its ugly barbarisms and cruelties. Also, this new industry is unorganized, highly competitive, and controlled by no enlightened public opinion or humane legislation. The result is that industrial history in this state is reduplicating the industrial history of all the rest of America. The workers are revolting against oppression, fighting for the right to organize, and the employers are resisting them with force and violence. Will men never learn?

Must Religion Be an Illusion?

[A Reply to Freud]

Religious formulas are numerous. Freud takes his stand by this one:

"Religion consists of certain dogmas, assertions about facts and conditions of external (or internal) reality, which tell one something that one has not oneself discovered and which claim that one should give them credence."*

If the writer had said: "Religions *consist*" etc., we could have accepted the formula. It is true that all the religions consist of dogmas and assertions which more or less emphatically one is ordered to accept. But there is a spiritual content independent of the dogmas and assertions which have professed to expound it; an inward immaterial essence which constitutes *religion* as distinguished from the formulated and organized *religions,* and which, so far from being an illusion, is a tremendous psychic reality coming within the circle of the sciences as truly as does physiology itself. Freud would probably include such a psychic entity in the science he would substitute for the religions; in which case, his science would include the religious feeling. As regards the physical universe, science has driven the myths of religion from the field, and put supernaturalism out of action. Over and above creation myths, however, free religion recognizes certain ideal

*"The Future of an Illusion," by Sigmund Freud.

values in nature and the mind of man, and its ethical side consists of efforts to realize those values so as to make them operative in human existence.

The author next proceeds to examine in the light of psychology what religious ideas really are, and what may be their real worth. As a psycho-analyst, he inclines to regard religion,—not as the divine revelation for which it is offered, (and in this we are with him), but,—as "the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity," and as "a system of wish-illusions."

While also spurning the idea of divine revelation, I am unable to follow a line of argument which regards religion as a sacred disease. I remember that the religious sentiment appears to be as germane to human nature as, say, aesthetics, and that it originally set out to acquire such knowledge of its universe as was possible in that early day. To make those comparisons is at the same time to state my belief that, like aesthetics and knowledge, religion is capable of purification and expansion to the widest capacities of man's brain and heart.

Neither can I regard religion as merely a wish-illusion; if for no other reason than that it has developed in certain directions quite contrary to the usual wishes and desires of normal humanity. Spite of the deplorable weakness of human nature, and its inability to achieve its ideals—resulting in what we call the "inconsistencies" of religious people—the fact remains that religion has usually commended such virtues as purity, honesty, truthfulness, humility, unselfishness, mercy, which assuredly do not arise spontaneously from or fit themselves comfortably into the wishing cap of unregenerate man. When the times comes that science takes charge of our inner culture it will have to take over those virtues, and thus transform itself into religion; or it may decline to take them over, and prefer to cultivate a race of egoistic super-men, according to Nietzsche at his worst. Who lives longest sees most.

Religion as Freud understands it is an illusion—

"the most important part of the psychical inventory of a culture: that is to say, its—in the broadest sense—religious ideas; in other words, the use of which will be justified later, its illusions"

Further:

"It is characteristic of the illusion that it is derived from men's wishes."

Is that wholly true? Most of the religious systems referred to included varieties of malicious spirits, demons, a malignant devil and an eternal tormenting hell. Can these have been derived from men's wishes? Would it not be more reasonable to regard them as arising from man's infantile endeavor to interpret the wild and savage forces of this universe? It is obvious that psycho-analytic motivation fails to account for the entire content of the religious idea.

Proceeding to test the dogmas of Religion, Dr. Freud states three grounds on the strength of which our credence is demanded. It is asserted by authoritarian religions that—

"They [the dogmas] deserved to be believed: firstly, because our primal ancestors believed them; secondly, because we possess proofs, which have been handed down to us from this very period of antiquity; and thirdly, because it is forbidden to raise the question of their authenticity at all."

We are not surprised that Dr. Freud rightly considers these assumptions to be impossible of proof; but it is more startling to read that their "reality value" can be neither proved nor refuted "just as no one can be forced into belief, so no one can be forced into unbelief." The imaginary opponent with whom he enlivens his pages objects—

"well, then, if even the crabbed sceptics admit that the statements of religion cannot be confuted by reason, why should not I believe in them, since they have so much on their side—tradition, the concurrence of mankind, and all the consolation they yield?"

To which the writer's response is: "Yes, why not?" But mark! you do so at your peril:

"No reasonable man will behave so frivolously in other matters, or rest content with such feeble grounds for his opinions or for the attitude he adopts; it is only in the highest and holiest things that he allows this. In reality these are only attempts to delude oneself or other people into the belief that one still holds fast to religion, when one has long cut oneself loose from it. Where questions of religion are concerned people are guilty of every possible kind of insincerity and intellectual misdemeanor. Philosophers stretch the meaning of words until they retain scarcely anything of their original sense; by calling 'God' some vague abstraction which they have created for themselves, they pose as deists, as believers, before the world. They may even pride themselves on having a higher and purer idea of God, although their God is nothing but an insubstantial shadow, and no longer the mighty personality of religious doctrine."

I have quoted this paragraph as a kind of test of the intellectual validity of free religion. Is free religion also playing the game of make-believe? I think not. It is necessary to bear in mind that religion too is half-blinded by the glare of new knowledge, and it is not discreditable that honest questers scarce know where they are. Everything has gone into the melting-pot these last five-and-twenty years. The problems of the 19th century with which some of us wrestled are left far behind. Science has thrown the religious world-view quite out of perspective. Physics, biology, and astronomy have filtrated the very ground under the feet of orthodox Judaism and Christianity. One by one we have been swept away from the straws at which we clutched as the tide of knowledge rose and raged against us. The New Theology of Munger and Campbell, liberal Judaism, liberal Christianity, social Christianity, divine immanence, Platonic idealism, Ritschlianism, Bergsonism, Modernism,—from one refuge after another the inexorable voice of science drove us out, saying: "On, on, here you cannot rest." There is very little of Dr. Freud's criticism of the religions that we have not urged from time to time, but — here is the important divergence — in the very interest of religion itself. And now, at the moment, where are we? Who knows? Not Dr. Freud. For, listen:

"When I say that they [religious ideas] are illusions, I

must define the meaning of the word. An illusion is not the same as an error, it is indeed not necessarily an error." "It does not lie within the scope of this enquiry to estimate the value of religious doctrines as truth. It suffices that we have recognized them, psychologically considered, as illusions. But we need not conceal the fact that this discovery strongly influences our attitude to what must appear to many the most important of questions. We know approximately at what periods and by what sort of men religious doctrines were formed. If we now learn from what motives this happened, our attitude to the problem of religion will suffer an appreciable change. We say to ourselves: it would indeed be very nice if there were a God, who was both creator of the world and a benevolent providence, if there were a moral world order and a future life, but at the same time it is very odd that this is all just as we should wish it ourselves. And it would be still odder if our poor, ignorant, enslaved ancestors had succeeded in solving all these difficult riddles of the universe."

That important passage cannot be lightly passed over. It bewilders us a little to be told that illusion is not the same as error, for in that case might not the religious ideas we discard be after all correct? And it is positively staggering to have it calmly taken for granted that religious doctrines, even though recognized to be illusions, might still have some value as truth! Is there then some conflict between the psychological and the logical? Does not the very test of an illusion consist in this—that being taken for truth it is on examination found to be untrue? The argument here seems to be confined into thin air, e-lusive certainly, if not also il-lusive, as the writer elsewhere half suspects.

Further, suppose it were correct to say that a belief was necessarily an illusion because one wished it to be true, I have already shown that certain important beliefs could not possibly have sprung from wish-motivation. But even so, the assertion that a belief cannot be true because one wishes it to be true seems to me to be sheer dogmatism. With regard to the doctrines just quoted, we may view them with Dr. Freud's own incredulity, yet not because early man wished them to be true (which is a doubtful and entirely unprovable proposition), nor because it seems to us that historically they had a quite different origin, but simply because, apart from irrelevant questions of origin, as interpretations of the physical and moral universe they are much too *naive* for the modern mind. This portion of the argument appears to my mind like a bit of special pleading in the interests of psycho-analysis, rather than an unbiased scientific enquiry into religious origins.

Finally, the religious person, as distinguished from the creedalist, may breathe more freely when he comes to Dr. Freud's admission that—

"other cultural possessions which we esteem highly and by which we let our life be ruled, (may) be of a similar nature. Should not the assumptions that regulate our political institutions likewise be called illusions, and is it not the case that in our culture the relations between the sexes are disturbed by an erotic illusion, or by a series of erotic illusions?"

It is unnecessary to pursue that line further. If politics and sex are illusions in the same sense as religion, then religion is secure whatever happens to the religions. For while everybody desires to reform politics and sex, none but madmen dream of abolishing them. By parity of reasoning, new reformations of religion do not include its extinction.

Religion, Freud admits, has done much for mankind, yet not enough. One important passage must be quoted:

"it is doubtful whether men were in general happier at a time when religious doctrines held unlimited sway than they are now; more moral they certainly were not. They have always understood how to externalize religious precepts, thereby frustrating their intentions. And the priests, who had to enforce religious obedience, met them half-way. . . . It is well known that the priests could only keep the masses submissive to religion by making these great concessions to human instincts. . . . Immorality, no less than morality, has at all times found support in religion."

The conclusion is that religion may not be necessary for mankind, or for culture and civilization. Men are not more likely to murder one another when they discover that the murder prohibition has a social foundation instead of a theological one; which is very true. So the writer proceeds:

"As it is a delicate task to decide what God has himself ordained and what derives rather from the authority of an all-powerful parliament or a supreme judicial decision, it would be an indubitable advantage to leave God out of the question altogether, and to admit honestly the purely human origin of all cultural laws and institutions."

To Freudian criticism, God is naturally the greatest illusion of all, but the criticism loses its logical force by its entanglement with psycho-analytic theory and the vexed problem of totemism. So far as I understand, science neither affirms nor denies the existence of God, though it puts out of court all anthropomorphic theologies. The idea of the Absolute belongs to philosophy, where I do not find the theistic idea demolished but on the contrary enhanced by being dissociated from the "mighty personality" to which Freud and others would (for their own dialectical purposes) conveniently seek to confine it.

I have often said that I refuse to affirm what is commonly described as "the personality of God," not because I think God to be less but more than a person. Like Richard Jefferies, "I realize the existence of an inexpressible entity infinitely higher than deity." This may be dismissed by scientific narrowness as no more than an emotional inheritance, and may be proved to be so, but until it is disowned by philosophy I stand by it. If it must be so, let the word "God" stand to us as a symbol of the true, the good, and the beautiful in the physical and moral universe; as the sum total of the universal striving; as every man's highest ideal, and the collective ideal of the race.

I pass from this side of my study by quoting a passage as eloquent as it is impressive. Driven by stress of his own argument Dr. Freud admits the possibility of a theistic conception against which science could find nothing to say:

"Certainly if you confine yourself to the belief in a higher spiritual being, whose qualities are indefinable and whose intentions cannot be discerned, then you are proof against the interference of science, but then you will also relinquish the interest of men."

It is already plain that Dr. Freud's substitute for the Illusion is science:

"We believe that it is possible for scientific work to discover something about the reality of the world through which we can increase our power and according to which we can regulate our life. If this belief is an illusion, then we are in the same position as you [his imaginary opponent] but science has shown us by numerous and significant successes that it is no illusion."

Here I endorse every word. We expect much from the beneficent influence of chemistry, physiology, and biology in the production of a finer race; from psychology and psychiatry in the improvement of character; and from the social sciences in pushing on the realization of human solidarity. Science has shown us how to do for ourselves what earlier man besought from his gods.

The substitution of science for religion would include a different kind of education. Freud thinks it possible that their religious up-bringing is largely to blame for the relative degeneration of children, and he would substitute what he calls *"education to reality"*:

"Need I tell you that it is the sole aim of my book to draw attention to the necessity for this advance?"

Here also, however, there is danger as well as hope. But we must pass on.

If now we examine these grand scientific ambitions, we are discouraged by several difficulties. In the first place, the author frankly, with manly sincerity, admits that he too may be chasing after an illusion. . . influenced by his personal wishes. Man may prove to be a creature of weak intelligence who is governed by his instinctual wishes:

"These pieces of knowledge from individual psychology may be inadequate, their application to the human race unjustified, the optimism without foundation; I grant you the uncertainty of all these things. But often we cannot refrain from saying what we think, excusing ourselves on the ground that it is given for no more than it is worth."

The modesty of these sentiments disarms criticism. But there is more. There is a striking reminder that —if I may so express it—if science, like the Hindu trinity, includes Brahma the creator and Vishnu the preserver, it includes also Siva the destroyer: if science takes over God from Judaism and Christianity, it takes over Satan also. Listen:

"Human creations are easy to destroy, and science and technical skill, which have built them up, can also be turned to their destruction."

In these days when all the world is preparing to destroy itself by scientific explosives, suffocating gases, poisons, and massacring machinery, no commentary is called for. So accurate a thinker as Bertrand Russell has warned us that science also has its superstitions. The physical sciences disclose facts without assigning moral values to them. Who or what is to supply the moral values? I am not easily disposed to accept the superstitions of science just when I have unloaded the shibboleths of religion, or to replace the dethroned idols of theology by the doubtful deities of mechanics and chemistry. Through fifty years of mental struggle I have made myself free, and it will require a more ingenious plea than that of Dr. Freud—and it would be hard to find a more ingenious one—to persuade me to resume a new set of dogmas under a new name.

The audacious ambitions of modern science do not offend me. I do not see any objection to science absorbing religion any more than to religion becoming scientific. Dr. Freud is representative of the enlarged field of modern science which claims to take in the whole man, body, and what is commonly called "soul." Such science may include the arts as well as religion. It is finding a natural place for the spiritual, creating a new naturalism just as religion created a new theology. The new naturalism may come to regard nature as the friend of man, and not merely a machine of blind forces. In reconciling us to nature it may also bring us in tune with the infinite. It may enlarge the sphere of the imaginative in poetry, art, music, and song. It may evolve sweeter harmonies in social relations. The crucial point however is—will it develop and cultivate that inward and personal communion with the universe which is the kernel, essence, and soul of religion? We live by admiration, hope, and love, sang Wordsworth. That is religion, and I care not though you call it science. Will it unite the religions and races in human service, and in the great tasks of culture, civilization, dominion over the elements, and control over the warring interests of factions, classes, and nations? Will it take over the quest of the ideal in the personal and collective life of man? If it does, science may wear its honors. Religion will have won its victory.

WALTER WALSH.

Jottings

Premier MacDonald, we are told, is so confident of success in his navy parleys with President Hoover in Washington, that he is bringing no experts with him. Here is assurance of success indeed! Get the experts out of these conferences, and disarmament will be easy.

Mr. Hoover, in a recent moment of frankness, declared that, in his opinion, the President should have power to execute at least two men a year, and no questions asked. Bernard Shaw has lately asserted that any man who talked about the coming of "the next war," should be summarily executed. Are our public men suddenly getting bloodthirsty, or is there a real need of capital punishment for a different line of criminals than those now honored with attention?

A physician has declared that men and women should sleep as a kitten sleeps—curled up! We have

tried it, but for the life of us we can't get our heads to repose on our hind legs.

The passenger on the "Graf Zeppelin" who, in the face of the strictest rules forbidding smoking, insisted upon lighting his cigar, is a perfect example of the lawless American. "Rules are made to be broken," he said. It is in the interest of selfish boors of this description that we are asked to repeal or change the Prohibition Amendment!

"Yesterday's scheduled sham battle between the army and navy off Sandy Hook could not be fought after all, because the fog was so thick that the army couldn't see the navy."—New York *World.*

Now just think of that! And we had always supposed that battles were fought in all weathers, and that fog was particularly favorable to the attacking force. A "sham" battle, indeed!

Endurance flights this past summer rapidly became endurance tests of the public's patience. How much longer are these childish stunts to last in an industry which should be serious?

J. H. H.

America—West to East

(Editorial Correspondence)

Seattle to New York. One of the easiest and pleasantest journeys in the land is to board the 6:15 p. m. train of the Northern Pacific. In two days of comfort you are in St. Paul. The next morning, in Chicago. Another morning, in New York. No change of stations at Chicago, but right through on the Pennsylvania. Observation car, with *Collier's, Scribner's, Saturday Post, Christian Science Monitor,* and barber shop, for men and women—with bath.

I was scarcely seated when the conductor came along, asked to see my ticket, for which he gave me a slip receipt. That completed the transportation transaction for the whole journey to Chicago. A little later an official came along, addressed me politely, saying, "I am the steward. If there is anything that I can do to serve you, let me know." I noted afterwards, in the dining car, that his name was A. W. Sutton. He seemed to be as attentive to the needs of the passengers as the captain of an Atlantic liner when off bridge duty. Such little attentions are like oiling the wheels of the buggy. It made me feel religious, and I got to thinking of the numberless people, from Seattle to New York—in the mountains, across the plains and deep rivers—everywhere someone punching a button, throwing a switch, shoveling some coal, roasting a "big potato," carrying a valise for my comfort and protection—in number about as the number of my ancestors, if we count back to St. Paul of Tarsus—it was almost equal to the psalmist's idea of God's care, "He slumbers not, nor sleeps."

A Japanese friend, Mr. Terezawa, came to the train to see me off. The Japanese, God bless them, have an idea that full good luck is possible only when you arrange the fit farewell. We talked about Kagawa and Saito, those two remarkable Japanese, who are inspiring a wonderful spiritual movement in Japan. May it spread to America! It may. Kagawa is out for a million (not dollars) souls for Christ. Saito is pushing a movement that is called "Friends of Jesus." He is particular to whom the little badge of fellowship is given. One discerns something of the spirit of Gandhi in it. Terezawa is giving much time and money in promoting these movements. The Orient hasn't done with the Occident yet. When the Occident gets through blowing its tin horns and firing its cannon and waving its flags—gets out of the mud-pie age—there may come flaming spirits from the Orient, to save our souls. (Yet, how dreadful our condition of mind and soul, when San Francisco snubs and insults Tagore, and Mr. Hearst throws wide open the doors of his estate to Mr. Churchill, from London!) The star of hope once rose in the Orient. What about Gandhi, Sun Yat Sen, Kagawa, Tagore? And, where are our prophets? That talk with Terezawa, the lumber merchant, was a good-bye that lasted long. And next morning, at the breakfast table, the invitation to accept a little cup of coffee—"it's on the company, just an eye-opener"—one couldn't help being happy, with no calls to make, and all outdoors to gaze at.

I am glad to announce that the "wild and woolly West" is beginning to clothe itself. Among the victories that the West is recording these days—when the tallies are all in, after the regattas, and games of tennis and golf; furnishing a President, also the "best climate"—the West is now in a position to claim that the best rugs produced in U. S. A. are made in Oregon City. Better than that, the best all wool (still woolly but not "wild") clothes made in the country are made in Oregon City. Oregon produces the article from the wool on the back of the sheep, clear through until the finished product reaches the back of the well-dressed customer.

With a Seattle made hat—fit to hang on the same rack with a Dunlap—and an Oregon made suit of clothes (thus properly patriotic), and the gratis eye-opener cup of coffee, I was ready to lift up my eyes upon the prairies and skies as we rolled along through the Yakima Valley and across Idaho, the land of Borah—where a man is encouraged to swing his arms and breathe deep. And such skies! Not enough has been made of the beauty and glory of the clouds. We have been trained so long to lift up our eyes to the hills, that the clouds have been overlooked.

I have never been partial to the "unknown soldier" idea, because it seems to have been applied more to promote and foster militarism than in thought for the private who has given his life. At any rate, if there is to be anything of the kind to be done, it might be better to celebrate the services of the "unknown pioneer" whose bones are strewn all the way from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean—the mothers, the children, the scouts, the farmers, the missionaries and teachers—more of these fell than fell in the desert from the Red Sea to the Promised Land.

In a way, this has been done. For, as you pass through Pasco, you know that you are at the gateway to the valley where Whitman worked and died. The name of Clark is written many times into the naming of places and rivers. Ravilla, Montana, speaks of the labors of that priest in the early part of last century, while DeSmet brings to mind the work of another priest. In the same way, you pass through places called Bozeman, Gallatin, Garrison, Custer. One is impressed with the vastness of the continent, when at one point he is informed that a drop of water divides, part of it starting for the Pacific, the other part making for the Missouri. At another point, the drop of water is divided—a part to start for the Mississippi, the other part for Hudson Bay.

There are advantages in seeing America from West to East. Traveling westward, one is impressed with the pioneer aspects of our land, with the movement of human life across the continent, as it were the flow of the tide. Things grow fresher as one goes westward. People are less and less conventional. As he travels eastward, he is more impressed with the roots from which our institutions have sprung. One is going "back home." To get a complete idea of America, one should travel both eastward and westward.

The greatest impression upon me, as I have gone both ways, has been the fact that starting with the Atlantic, our history is that of the growth of free institutions. From the windows, as you pass through any town or village throughout the whole 3,000 mile stretch, you are sure to see free public schools, free churches, free libraries. Our civilization has been *people*-produced. It is our strength. We must not forget it. From such towns as Little Falls come our Lindberghs. The *people* have gone West when they were ready, they settled where they pleased, they planted the kind of institutions they desired.

While rolling eastward on the Northern Pacific, I learned something about our neighbor to the North—Canada, with whom above all other neighbors we should strive for peace, even to taking down all barriers of passport and tariff between us. I enjoyed the companionship for two days of Mr. and Mrs. J. G. Pearce, and charming little daughter of ten, of Victoria, B. C. Victoria is one of the earliest English settlements on the Coast. It is even charged with importing its climate from the South of England—so alike are they. Mr. Pearce is attached to the observatory in Victoria, which has, to my surprise, the second largest lens in the world. Lick's has the largest. Mr. Pearce was going on to attend a meeting of astronomers to be held in Ottawa. For five years, or more, he has been observing over 1,000 stars—all larger than our sun—to discern by heat measurements whether each one was getting colder, or hotter—in other words, whether each particular star was on the decline, or not. Here was something more wonderful than the clouds! He was coming on to tell the astronomers the results of his observations. It makes one quite dizzy to know that the light that he had been measuring in some of the stars had started on its way for his telescope 500, 1,000, or 5,000 years ago, or much more. . . . Startlingly refreshing it was to discover later that there was no subject that this astronomer was delighted to talk about more than the ethics of Jesus. He believes that the personality of Jesus holds the key to the interpretation of the universe. He is a modernist, but highly spiritual, and for his ethics would go to the three first gospels. The next day, I was telling a family of relatives in Ohio about Mr. Pearce and how surprised I was to find such a combination; and a young woman in the twenties at the table said, "Why so?" And she proceeded to say that science and the ethics of Jesus were quite consistent! In fact, one was needed for the other! And I whispered to myself, "Wake up! You have been sleeping at the switch."

This astronomer believes in the Church union that has been secured in Canada. He is an officer in the United Church in Victoria. He related a fact, mention of which had escaped my attention. Namely, so celebrated has the success of church union become that 1,000 churchmen from England—mostly laymen—had recently spent three months in Canada for the express purpose of seeing how it was done, and how it worked. I am often impressed with the fact that many things are occurring in Canada well worth knowing about which nothing is printed in our press.

A friend in Seattle told me that I must read "On the Western Front." "Take my copy," she said, and thrust it in my hands. Well, I read it. It is, of course, important in the emphasis placed on the effect upon those who remain, after the war is over. It is a picture of hell broke loose, and what happens to the victims left alive. I said during the last war that I should prefer to have my son shot than to have him shoot another man whatever might be the motive. I am willing to pass this word on to my grandchildren, to all generations. War is crime. War is sin. All who take part in war are guilty. Mr. Pearce wished to read the book. He had been through the war—starting as Lieutenant and coming out as Major, in France; said he was a pacifist now. When he handed the book back, he said slowly with emphasis, *"it is all true."*

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Land That Men Call Free

This is the land that men call free.
May God forgive such blasphemy!

The land that hounds its prisoners
In filthy pens like beaten curs,

Prisoners who dare defy
Each act of shame, each blatant lie

Of king of mine, of lord of mill,
Of agents of the law who kill.

They stand like great oaks in a wood,
Rooted to dreams of brotherhood,

And never court or jury's rage
Or iron bars of iron cage

Can rob them of the faith they share
In comrades who will not despair.

This is the land that men call free.
May God forgive such blasphemy.

ELENORE BLAKE.

Across the Threshold

[Special Correspondence from Geneva]

When the Assembly of the League of Nations opened its tenth session last week its eyes looked out upon a changed world, on the threshold of which it found itself standing. The Pact of Paris had created a new international heaven and earth. Already this venture in human concord could boast more signatory nations than there were members of the League. A wave of friendliness to America for having helped refashion the international situation was everywhere manifest. The Hague Conference, where debate, at times acrimonious, and sharp disagreements threatened Europe with economic disruption, suddenly resolved itself into an accord that flooded the world atmosphere with optimistic sunshine. A week before the League met, in conversation with a friend who had been a trusted member of the Secretariat from its earliest days, I was given an intimate view of the hopelessness of The Hague situation and a revelation of the conviction that the approaching meeting of the Assembly appeared doomed to failure without some miracle at the Dutch capital—a graphic picture of the seriousness of the crisis reached in European affairs. But though unscheduled and unforeseen the miracle came and the reaction among the members of the League and its host of friends gathered here from all quarters of the globe was a phenomenon well worth traveling thousands of miles to witness.

With Paris Pact and Hague Agreements actually achieved there sprang into life a consciousness of the emergence upon the arena of history of a fresh, youthful, buoyant and courageous force that would not hesitate to attempt the transformation of our old, outworn, over-nationalized and divided world into a bona-fide family of cooperating men and women. Mr. Snowden at The Hague had set this consciousness tingling while the conversations of Ambassador Dawes and the British Prime Minister started the nations guessing what two such potentialities as Hoover and MacDonald might not spring in the political and economic spheres.

It was before the Parliament of Man that the leading statesman of our day (for such Britain's doughty Scot is fast demonstrating himself to be) took up the role to which destiny is calling him in an utterance so simple, natural and straightforward that it stirred to the depths every soul who heard it. It has been my privilege to listen to many mighty appeals to reason and conscience but in timeliness, ideality and practical application to dominant human needs none has approached in power the speech of Ramsay MacDonald to the League Assembly on Tuesday of last week.

First of all it breathed a great faith in man. In the face of tiny souls who belittle the Pact of Peace (as MacDonald dubs the Outlawry of War agreement signed in August, 1928, in Paris) he exclaimed:

> We have started upon another road. The Pact of Peace has been signed in Paris, and that Pact is now the starting-point of our future work. . . . The British Government, and I am sure everyone else, though I speak for the British Government, is anxious that that Pact shall not only be a declaration on paper, but shall be translated into constitutions and institutions that will work for the peace of Europe.

This confidence in man flowered throughout the address into a contagion of optimism. He hoped that the agreements found at The Hague would within a few weeks be signed by all the parties thereto. He looked for a settlement between Britain and America on naval armaments also inside of several weeks. He expected that all the Dominions of the Empire would sign the Optional Clause before the adjournment of the Assembly and expressed the hope "that the tenth ordinary session of the Assembly of the League may be known as the Optional Clause Assembly."

Again it was a speech of ringing declarations. "Security is very largely a problem in psychology," a word that European Powers, obsessed with the will-o'-the-wisp of security, needed to hear from that fine compound of Scotch idealism and practical common sense. With this as a basis, when he touched upon the problem of disarmament the movement of his thought was irresistible. Instantly his hearers saw that disarmament must inevitably and immediately create the ideology of Security which armaments always have made impossible and always must.

> The peoples will never feel comfortable, will never be able to trust to common sense—ordinary, sound, human common sense—until you and I and all of us together, by cooperative enterprise have substantially reduced the risks of war; and one of the greatest risks of war is that some of the nations—all of them—are still too heavily armed. . . . My Government would urge the Commissions—the Preparatory Commission and the others—not to face their problems from the point of view of the possibility of war, because they will never go very far if they face their problems in that way. I would urge them to face them on the assumption that the risk of war breaking out now is far less than the hope of peace being permanently observed. We have to ask our military advisers to remember that there is just as much security in a political agreement as there is in a regiment of soldiers, or in a fleet of battleships.

Another of these splendid declarations was found in his reference to the United States-Great Britain conversations on naval armament:

> The conversations in which America and ourselves have been engaged are in no way directed against anybody, are in no sense a conspiracy against anybody. The British Government declines absolutely to build up against the United States, and the United States can take that statement as—I think I might call it—a last word, because it is not only the word of a Labor Government, but that of its predecessor, a Conservative Government.

How some of us cheered and longed to have our nation get the heart of this Worldsman's plea for freer trade:

> Tariff barriers between the producer and the consumer are certainly not justified by the experience of the world up to the present. . . . Under tariffs we have poverty, under tariffs we have low wages, under tariffs we have unemployment, under tariffs we have class conflicts, just as much as we have under a sort of disorganized free trade.

One chief difference in economic outlook between Europe and the United States is that over here they have experienced the truth of these sayings and appreciate the pledge—

> The British Government will heartily cooperate in every attempt to translate political agreements into economic agreements that make for economic freedom. Every effort to turn political nationality from being the cause of economic obstruction, and to make it an instrument in economic co-operation, will receive the support of Great Britain.

There is not space enough to quote all the words of comfort and cheer that extended the assurance of friendly co-operation to the peoples of the Far East (China and India by implication) in gaining full self-control and closing:

> There rests the danger of war between one side of the

world and the other; and by facing the problem in time we shall extend the realm of peaceful negotiation, resulting in the liberties of the peoples of the earth.

Consummate courage shone from end to end of this towering utterance. The typical politician thinks and acts not with his head in the air but with his feet on the ground. He fights shy of great progressive issues, but this Labor-Premier again and again pledged his Government to dare idealistic ventures:

The British Government will do all in its power to hasten the preparations for the Disarmament Conference. . . . We are not out for small things; we are out for an agreement which will establish peace as well as naval ratios.

The most important of these ventures so far as our country is concerned is suggested by the words:

I would like you to consider the effect of the Pact of Peace upon the assumptions of certain clauses of the Covenant of the League of Nations, because it is all to the good if we can prune out dead wood from the Covenant. There were certain clauses, certain assumptions, certain ideas in the back of our minds when the Covenant was drafted which already represented a dead age. . . . I ask you to consider whether we cannot bring that very old document into relation with certain things that have happened since.

It took a brave man to say to the Assembly of the League that there was "dead wood" in its Covenant. Later his Foreign Minister, Mr. Henderson, in a most frank and irresistible fashion, showed how incompatible the Pact of Peace is with the war provisions of the League Covenant and detailed what his chief was demanding in his plea for pruning out its dead wood. There are many timid souls in the League who still live in the era of the mad quest for security through increased armaments and there are others who have come to look upon the Covenant as sacrosanct and not to be changed, but the wide support which has greeted Mr. MacDonald's amending proposition is most significant. One of the most hopeful signs is that no one seems to urge these inevitable Covenant changes as a means of facilitating America's entrance into the League. The arguments are directed to the one point that the Pact of Peace ends war and not only must the Covenant be purged of its war articles but every other agency like armaments that foster war must now be swept away.

One of the most dramatic and appealing sections of this epoch-building speech was its closing words. It will not bear cutting:

There is a very good verse in the Scriptures which we ought to put up in letters of gold wherever the League of Nations assembles, the verse which says that "he who draws the sword shall perish by the sword."

I do not want my country to perish. I do not want that little corner of my country from which I come, Scotland, to cease to exist as a self-respecting, co-operating community of people. I do not want the immediate islands that lie off the coasts of Europe, Great Britain and Ireland, to perish. I do not want that further-flung commonwealth, composed of men and women, of communities beating out for themselves the precious inheritance of nationhood while preserving in their hearts a sense and a recognition of that mysterious and mystic common tie by which, side by side with their nationhood, they feel a kinship with ourselves—I do not want that commonwealth to perish. I do not want it to be a menace. I do not want it to be a selfish power using material authority to impose its will. No! If nations are to live, and commonwealths are to live, they must live by enlightenment; and the greatest test of enlightenment in these days is to show our willingness to reduce armaments, to banish from our minds old ideas of security, and to throw ourselves with courage, unflinchingly, into the position—that we trust men and women and nations who come and make bargains with us.

We will do our part, they will do their part; and, in order that this may be done without a break, we set up courts to take the place of arms, we set up conciliation to take the place of threats, we agree that reason is the greatest creative power in the universe, and, on that basis, the Government which I represent here today is willing to take those tremendous steps toward a new era of international relations because it does not want the substance of its nation, of the nations, to be wasted. It does not want people to be impoverished and it does not want civilization itself to be destroyed by further resort to arms.

In these days of Sheererism, giving to this term all that it connotes concerning the depths to which war advocates in our land can descend, and in the face of such declarations as those of the highest authority on earth voiced a few days ago by Francis P. Garvan of New York, is not this glowing appeal of the British Prime Minister an irresistible summons to our people to sweep away all armaments and to throw all their influence on the side of the Government of Great Britain, pressing for the divorce of the League of Nations from every possible provision for warfare by the amendment of its Covenant proposed by Ramsay MacDonald, that our nation may take its rightful place therein?

Geneva, Switzerland. DOREMUS SCUDDER.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

(Copyrighted, 1929)

PART V—CHAPTER XXXVI

The Khilafat Against Cow Protection?

We must now leave for the time being these dark happenings in the Punjab.

The Congress inquiry into Dyerism in the Punjab had just commenced when I received a general letter of invitation to be present at a joint Conference of Hindus and Musalmans that was to meet at Delhi to deliberate on the Khilafat question. Among the signatories to it were the late Hakim Ajmal Khan Saheb and Mr. Asaf Ali. The late Swami Shraddhanandji, it was stated, would be attending, and if I remember aright, he was to be the vice-president of the Conference, which, so far as I can recollect, was to be held in the November of that year. The letter went on to say, among other things, that not only the Khilafat question but the question of cow protection as well would be discussed at the Conference, and it would, therefore, afford a golden opportunity for a settlement of the cow question. I did not like this reference to the cow question. In my letter, in reply to the invitation, therefore, whilst promising to do my best to attend, I suggested that the two questions should not be mixed up together, or considered in the spirit of a bargain, but should be decided on their own merits and treated separately.

With these thoughts filling my mind, I went to the Conference. It was a very well attended gathering though it did not present the spectacle of later gatherings that were attended by tens of thousands. I discussed the question referred to above with the late Swami Shraddhanandji who was present at the Conference. He appreciated my argument and left it to me to place it before the Conference. I likewise discussed it with the late Hakim Saheb. Before the Con-

ference I contended that if the Khilafat question had a just and legitimate basis, as I believe it had, and if the Government had really committed a gross injustice, the Hindus were bound to stand by the Musalmans in their demand for the redress of the Khilafat wrong. It would ill become them to bring in the cow question in this connection, or to use the occasion to make terms with the Musalmans, just as it would ill become the Musalmans to offer to stop cow slaughter as a price for the Hindus' support on the Khilafat question. But it would be another matter, and quite graceful, and reflect great credit on them, if the Musalmans of their own free will stopped cow slaughter out of regard for the religious sentiments of the Hindus, and from a sense of duty towards them as neighbors and children of the same soil. To take up such an independent attitude was, I contended, their duty and would enhance the dignity of their conduct. But if the Musalmans considered it as their neighbourly duty to stop cow slaughter they should do so regardless of whether the Hindus helped them in the Khilafat or not. "That being so," I argued, "the two questions should be discussed independently of each other and the deliberations of the Conference should be confined to the question of the Khilafat only." My argument appealed to those present, and as a result, the question of cow protection was not discussed at this Conference. But in spite of my warning the Musalmans felt called upon at later conferences always to allude to the duty of stopping cow slaughter in grateful recognition of the Hindus' help on the Khilafat question. And at one time it almost looked as if they would really put an end to it.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani was present in this meeting. I had known him even before, but it was only here that I discovered what a fighter he was. We differed from each other almost from the very beginning and in several matters the differences have persisted.

Among the numerous resolutions that were passed at this Conference one called upon both Hindus and Musalmans to take the Swadeshi vow, and as a natural corollary to it, to boycott foreign goods. Khadi had not as yet found its proper place. This was not a resolution that Hasrat Saheb would accept. His object was to wreak vengeance on the British Empire in case justice was denied in the matter of the Khilafat. Accordingly he brought in a counter proposal for the boycott purely of British goods so far as practicable. I opposed it on the score of principle, as also practicability, adducing for it my arguments that have now become pretty familiar. I also put before the Conference my viewpoint of non-violence. I noticed that my arguments made a deep impression on the audience. Before me, Hasrat Mohani's speech had been received with such loud acclamations that I was afraid that mine would only be a cry in the wilderness. I had made bold to speak only because I felt that it would be a dereliction of duty not to lay my views before the Conference. But to my agreeable surprise, my speech was followed with the closest attention by those present, and evoked a full measure of support among those on the platform, and speaker after speaker rose to deliver speeches in support of my views. The leaders were able to see that not only would the boycott of British goods fail of its purpose, but would, if adopted, make of them a laughing stock. There was hardly a man present in that assembly but had some article of British manufacture on his person. Many of the audience therefore realised that nothing but harm could result from adopting a resolution that even those who voted for it were unable to carry out.

"Mere boycott of foreign cloth cannot satisfy us, for who knows how long it will be before we shall be able to manufacture Swadeshi cloth in sufficient quantity for our needs, and before we can bring about an effective boycott of foreign cloth? We want something that will produce an immediate effect on the British. Let your boycott of foreign cloth stand, we do not mind it, but give us something quicker, and speedier in addition"—so spoke in effect Maulana Hasrat Mohani. Even as I was listening to him I felt that something new, over and above boycott of foreign cloth, would be necessary. An immediate boycott of foreign cloth seemed to me also to be a clear impossibility at that time. I did not then know that we could, if we liked, produce enough Khadi for all our clothing requirements; this was only a later discovery. On the other hand I knew, even then, that if we depended on the mills alone for effecting the boycott of foreign cloth we should be betrayed. I was still in the middle of this dilemma when the Maulana concluded his speech.

I was handicapped for want of suitable Hindi or Urdu words. This was my first occasion for delivering an argumentative speech before an audience especially composed of Musalmans of the North. I had spoken in Urdu at the Muslim League at Calcutta but it was only for a few minutes and the speech was intended only to be a feeling appeal to the audience. Here on the contrary, I was faced with a critical, if not hostile, audience to whom I had to explain and bring home my viewpoint. But I had cast aside all shyness. I was not there to deliver an address in the faultless, polished Urdu of the Delhi Muslims, but to place before the gathering my views in such broken Hindi as I could command. And in this I was successful. This meeting afforded me a direct proof of the fact that Hindi-Urdu alone could become the *lingua franca* of India. Had I spoken in English I could not have produced the impression that I did on the audience, and the Maulana might not have felt called upon to deliver his challenge. Nor if he had delivered it, could I have taken it up effectively.

I could not hit upon a suitable Hindi or Urdu word for the new idea and that put me out somewhat. At last I described it by the word "non-cooperation," an expression that I used for the first time at this meeting. As the Maulana was delivering his speech it seemed to me that it was vain for him to talk about effective resistance to a Government with which he was co-operating in more than one thing, if resort to arms was impossible or undesirable. The only true resistance to the Government, it therefore seemed to me, was to cease to co-operate with it. Thus I arrived at the word non-cooperation. I had not then a clear idea of all its manifold implications. I therefore did not enter into details. So far as I remember, this meeting adopted a resolution about non-cooperation but it was several months before the idea made further headway. It remained buried for months in the records of this Conference.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by P.*)

The Study Table

The Eternal Jewish Question

Although utterly different in character and aim these three books* may well be considered together in that they all deal in varying fashion with the omnipresent and perplexing problem of the Jew in the cosmos. Jews are accused alternately of either superiority or inferiority complexes according to the bias of the observer albeit no self-respecting Jew can read these three books in juxtaposition without experiencing a distinctive impetus toward the development of an inferiority complex. So varied and conflicting are the approaches to this old yet ever new problem that one doubts the validity of all the writing.

Your reviewer is not at all sure that the first book to be treated, Tharaud's "The Chosen People," is really worthy of a notice in a journal of UNITY's reputation for liberalism of the higher order. Its subtitle is "A Short History of the Jews in Europe." One might well suggest that "A Parody on the History of the Jews in Europe" would fit it better. It is a thoroughly vicious book, for it attacks the Jews in the particularly noxious manner of the notorious and omnipresent enemy whose "best friends are Jews." The authors devote considerable space to Charlie Chaplin as a Jewish type. A fitting choice for so diverting a fairy tale posing as history. Inexactitude, verisimilitude and equivocation abound. It is a strange phantasmagoria of beautifully phrased malice. Suffice it to mention their comment on the Talmud, relative to which they quote the most trivial details without the slightest comprehension of the scope of this monumental contribution to human knowledge. A non-Jewish reviewer has well summed up the situation thus: "Our demands for conformity to Nordic captions meet in him (the Jew), fortunately, the resistence of an ancient racial strength. He has resources both intellectual and spiritual wherewith to combat the arbitrary standards which we, in a somewhat obtuse fashion, have attempted to impose upon him." As a cure for their unctuous rectitude it would help the Tharaud frères if they would read "Middletown."

The second book is "The Disenherited," by Milton Waldman. In a sense it is the logical sequence to "The Chosen People." So long as there are "Tharauds," there will be Michaelsons who find themselves disinherited in American life while equally foreign to Jewish life. This is a book by a Jew—it strives to be impartial and it suffers inevitably in that it challenges comparison to Ludwig Lewisohn's "Island Within," and comparisons are notoriously odious. This is no exception. The novel is a fairly interesting discussion of the Jewish position in America and still another variation of the foolish "melting-pot" theory. The novel suffers because the author clearly "wanders" himself in his search for orientation. Milton Waldman, like the hero of his novel, wants to have a cake and eat it at the same time, as so many Jews do. It is an untenable position.

"Christian and Jew," a symposium, is still another attempt to deal with the same problem. It is not in the same category as the other books, for its aim is laudable and lofty—i. e., to create better understanding. Whether it contributes much to this end is another question. Assuredly it will bring conviction neither to the pseudo-intellectual Tharauds nor to the ignorant remnant of the Klu Klux Klan. It would confuse the Tharauds and mystify the hooded brothers. Thirty-six distinguished folks, thirty-five men and one woman, give their views on anti-Semitism and the Jewish problem. The net resultant is "confusion worse confounded," ameliorated by a sense of satisfaction that there are at least thirty-six righteous in the modern Sodom. It is impossible to review these papers seriatim. One or two are funny—several mediocre, about four vital and stimulating. The funny ones are contributed by Charles Schwab and Mr. Filene, and they are not intentionally humorous but unintentionally so, in that they are a million miles from the theme. This makes Mr. Filene's the funniest. He is, it is understood, of Jewish blood, if not of allegiance, and he is evidently careful not to be led into any betrayal of this fact—to the uninitiated. He writes on "International Peace," and Norman Angell in his paper does it better. Charles Schwab writes on business, a choice morsel for the Tharauds. Elmer Davis pleads for more assimilation, and Isaac Abrahams for the exact opposite—more Jewishness, whatever that means! Ludwig Lewisohn would not agree with Mr. Davis, and moreover the panacea has been tried and on the whole found wanting. It was the slogan of the reform Rabbis a decade ago and they are slowly but surely abandoning it and replacing it with a plea for a Jewish Renaissance. Hendrick Van Loon contributes a really brilliant expose of the spirit of jingoism, while Jacob Wasserman argues with conviction against the futility of mollifying the Anti-Semite. Zona Gale's thoroughly characteristic plea for cultural approach or, as she would put it, civilized approach, is one of the worthwhile contributions. All in all one leaves the book with a sorrowful sense of futility. Maybe Raymond Fosdick in his epochal address to the students of Smith College provides the solution—"When men live their lives adventurously," despite the herd, the Tharauds et al will find it more difficult to hold an audience, and religion will bind men in bonds of love instead of sundering their innate affections.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

*"The Chosen People," by Jerome and Jean Tharaud; translated by Frances Wilson Huard; Longmans Green and Co. $2.00.

"The Disinherited," by Milton Waldman, 296 pp. New York, Longmans Green and Co. $2.00.

"Christian and Jew." A symposium for better understanding, edited by Isaac Landman, New York, Horace Liveright. $3.00.

Correspondence

An Appeal From Our Editor

Readers of UNITY:

In Soviet Russia, in Moscow, there is a gallant preacher who has organized a church of free religion. Over against the atheism of the Communists on the one hand and the superstition of Greek Catholic Orthodoxy on the other, Julius Hecker lifts high the light of liberal Christianity. This is a great achievement in Russia. What it means, and what it costs, is set forth in the following letter:

"If ever there was need for a progressive religious message it is now. . . . The old taboos are no longer feared and respected and the new moral standards based on class loyalty are as yet not sufficiently understood and appreciated. This is the negative aspect of the situation and it alarms many well-

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

CHICAGO ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday Morning Forum will hold its first meeting October 11, with a lecture by John Dugdale on "Why England's Youth Is Going Labor." Mr. Dugdale has a significant message. He was twice asked to stand for the British Parliament and is a writer for the *Manchester Guardian* and other papers.

October 18—Everett Dean Martin
What is an Educated Person?
Author, Director of the Peoples Institute and Instructor in the New School for Social Research, New York.

October 25—Paul Douglas
The Present Traction Situation in Chicago
Department of Industrial Relations, University of Chicago. Author. Contributor to *American Economic Review, Journal of Political Economy, etc.*

November 1—Melville J. Herskovits
The American Negro
Author. Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University, Evanston.

Three Lectures by Ferdinand Schevill:
November 8—
A Psychological Interpretation of Fascism
November 15—
The United States of Europe—An Illusion or a Necessity?
November 22—
On Writing History
Author of "Political History of Modern Europe," "The Making of Modern Germany," "History of the Balkan Peninsula," etc.

Watch this column for further lecture announcements.

Course tickets, $5.00. Single admission, 50 cents.

Also at Lincoln Centre
Tuesday Evening Discussion Group

Professor E. A. Burtt of the University of Chicago will give a series of ten lectures on The Conflict Between Science and Religion. The opening meeting will be held October 15th at 8:20.

Subjects

October 15—The Two-fold Nature of the Conflict.
October 22—The Intellectual Problem.
October 29—What is Scientific Truth?
November 5—Laws of Nature.
November 12—Creative Discovery.
November 19—The Role of Mathematics.
November 26—The Intellectual Reconciliation.
December 3—Institutional Problems.
December 10—Churches in an Age of Science.
December 17—Personal Religion.

For this course a popular price will be charged—$3.00 for the entire course; $5.00 for two members of the same family.

Director: Mrs. B. R. Davidson, 5312 Drexel Ave., Telephone Fairfax 3741.

THE MINISTRY STANDS FAST ON PROHIBITION

. . . And what of the ministry? The support which the Christian ministry has given to the campaign for the advancement of temperance by the only program which ever had a chance of success—that is, the complete suppression of the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic beverages—has been beyond praise. They have not dominated, but they have led. They have not truckled to a "dry" sentiment which they dared not oppose, but they have gone with it—and a little ahead. Many of them have served, and many of them still serve, congregations which would allow them any degree of "liberty" that they might feel disposed to claim. But the clerical opponents of Prohibition have become so rare that the discovery of one creates a sensation.

The effort on the part of the "wets" to lend an air of decency to their cause is evidenced by their frantic efforts to find clergymen who would become the spokesmen for their cause. The persistent publicity which has been given to the anti-Prohibition "Church Temperance Society" is a case in point. A clergyman whose significance in his own church would never have gotten him ten lines in any metropolitan paper was played up continually—because he was a preacher opposed to Prohibition. The man had bitten the dog, and it was news. There is not a preacher in the United States so obscure, so unimportant in his own communion or so insignificant in his home town that he could not get all the publicity his heart could desire—if publicity is what he wants—by coming out on the side of the "wets." And as for those religious leaders whose ability or positions have already given them some degree of prominence, there is scarcely any limit to the emoluments that they might secure by breaking from the ranks and going over to the enemy. But they don't do it. It would be an impertinence to praise them for the simple honesty involved in standing by their convictions. It is to be taken for granted that they would do that. The significant thing is that, standing by their convictions, they stand with the forces which are working to make this a temperate nation.

So serious, for the "wets," has been this dearth of clerical adherents to their

---

wishers of the revolution. On the other hand, the attacks on religion have roused many to think over the problem and now, I suppose, there is more searching and thinking on religion in Russia than in any other part of the world.

"You will be glad to learn that I succeeded in establishing a community pulpit in Moscow. . . .

"It is housed in a beautiful old Byzantine church holding about a thousand people. The organization is known as 'Red Chimes—the Church of the Toilers.' On Sunday morning there are services according to the Russian Orthodox cult and on Sunday evening a forum is held in which every shade of opinion has an equal right to express itself. There are Orthodox, Tolstoyans, theosophists, communists, anarchists, Jews and Gentiles. All enjoy the same right to express their views. There is no time limit for the speakers except the will of the audience, which, when they think that the speaker has said enough, shout 'Devolno,' which means enough, or they shout 'Prosin-prodolzhat,' which means 'please go on.' The meeting starts with an invocation at 6 p. m. and ends at 12 p. m. The chief speaker usually takes up from one or two hours for his lecture. The rest of the time is spent in discussion. This season I have given four lectures at this forum on the following subjects: 'Religion and Art,' 'Religion and Science,' 'The Bible in the Light of Modern Science,' 'Man, His Origin and Destiny.' Each subject attracted very large crowds and stimulated discussions.

"Besides, I am giving a regular course of lectures on Wednesday nights. For this season I chose the subject, 'The Struggle for a New Philosophy of Life.' So far I have delivered five lectures of this course, each of which was attended by not less than 300 to 400 people. This meeting lasts two and one-half hours, one-half of this time being used for answering questions. The intense interest in both the Wednesday lectures and the Sunday forum is the best proof that religion is not dead in Russia.

"This work is carried on under great handicaps. We are not permitted to advertise our meetings except by a small notice on the door of the church. We are not allowed to charge admission to the lectures, nor take subscriptions, hence our financial resources are very small, hardly enough to pay for the upkeep of the building and the janitor. Thus half the time we sit or, to be more exact, stand, for there are not enough seats to accommodate even half of the audience, in an unheated building.

"This 'Toilers' church' as an organization has existed since 1923 and is independent of both the 'Old' and the 'Living' churches. Its leaders are simple laymen from the ranks of the workers, but the church itself is attended by many intellectuals. I have known this organization for some time, but never thought that they would accept my cooperation and give me a free hand to carry out the program I have described. I am convinced that if this church is not closed by the civil authorities and I am left at liberty to do my work, we shall be able to develop a community institution which will spread its influence far beyond the limits of Moscow. It is now the only institution of its kind in Moscow and probably in the whole U. S. S. R.

"I am writing this because you and other friends of the community idea of religion will be glad to know that it is also planted in the republic of the soviets. Will it survive? I believe it will, especially with the sympathetic cooperation of our friends and brothers of the U. S. A."

I know Julius Hecker. He and his family attended my church in the days before the Russian Revolution, when they lived in America. He writes me that his church is a community church in Moscow, as mine is in New York. Knowing his heroism and devotion, and his sacrifice, I am engaged in raising a small sum of money for the support of his work and the relief of his family. I shall be glad and grateful if the readers of UNITY will help me. Contributions may be sent direct to me at 12 Park Avenue, New York.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

cause that they have been compelled to have recourse to ancient history. A few weeks ago the Association Against Prohibition sent broadcast a pamphlet containing an article by one "Rev. Sanford H. Cobb" on "The Theory of Prohibition." It was not a very fierce attack on prohibition at that, but it was, on the whole, on that side. But who is "Rev. Sanford H. Cobb" and when did he say these things? He was, as the foreword of the pamphlet informs us, a minister in the Dutch Reformed and Presbyterian churches. And he published this article just forty-two years ago! In the year of our Lord 1887!

Really, one would think that the Association Against Prohibition could have done better for itself than that. There must have been *some* preacher who has said something on their side of the argument in times more nearly contemporaneous. Must the dust of antiquity be disturbed to unearth even one mild utterance questioning the validity of the prohibition theory—and even then admitting that the policy might be justified by "the requirements of public safety?" It seems so. Mr. Cobb must be exhumed and brought forth as a witness that the clergy are weakening in their devotion to prohibition.

The exact opposite is the case, and the fact that the search for a clerical "wet" must be carried into times so remote and with such limited success even then is one evidence of it. The truth is that the ranks of the ministry stand fast. They have not yielded an inch, nor will they yield. Out of varied traditions and with diverse social backgrounds they have come, with an increasing solidarity, to a conviction that the national policy which now has the force of law is the right policy. This is no law that was delivered to them on the mount. It is no dogma to be accepted without question and enforced upon the laity without argument. It is a faith born of reason and experience." . . .—*The Christian Century.*

PAN-AMERICAN ARBITRATION TREATY

The severest test that faces the American peace movement next winter is the ratification of the Pan-American Arbitration Treaty. Mr. Charles Evans Hughes and Secretary Kellogg at the Pan-American Conference last January signed on behalf of the United States, without reservations, two treaties, one a treaty of conciliation and the other a treaty of arbitration. The difference between these two implements of peace needs to be understood by all, for these treaties are to be in future two of the mightiest defences available against war.

Conciliation procedure grew out of William J. Bryan's idea of the "cooling off period." Mr. Bryan had observed that, if nations did not fight while blood was hot, they were less likely to fight. So he negotiated many treaties that provided for a "cooling off period" of a year during which war was unlawful, no matter what the nature of the dispute. During this period a "conciliation" committee would investigate the dispute and make a report. The quarrelling nations would be under no obligation to accept the findings of the committee; but obviously a nation that was found in the right would not need to go to war, and a nation that was found in the wrong would be in a weak position for waging war, for it would be condemned by the moral sentiment of the world. The Senate of the United States has ratified the Pan-American Conciliation Treaty without reservation.

Arbitration is more rigid. It is nothing more nor less than going to court, and the disputants are morally and legally bound to accept the court's award. Being sovereign nations, they can conceivably ignore the decision, as the United States did with respect to a decision of the Central American Court against the sale to them by Nicaragua of the canal rights; but such conduct is now recognized as dishonourable, and the public conscience is becoming more enlightened every year on the sacredness of international courts and international obligations.

The Pan-American Treaty of Arbitration provides for the arbitration of four types of controversy which are generally recognized as legal disputes:

1. The interpretation of a treaty.
2. Any question of international law.
3. The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.
4. The nature and extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

In three respects this treaty marks important progress:

1. There are no such exceptions as have nullified or devitalised treaties in the past.
2. An old door of escape for would-be anarchist nations is closed by a provision that, if the parties to a dispute fail to agree on the definition of the matter at issue within three months, the court of arbitration shall formulate it.
3. The court of arbitration may be any existing court or a specially constituted tribunal of five members, three of whom are to be from nations not concerned in the controversy. (*National Council for Prevention of War News Bulletin.*)

You will enjoy the poems of passion and prophecy in

CHILDREN OF FIRE and SHADOW

the latest book by

LUCIA TRENT

Author of *Dawn Stars*

Regular Edition, $2.00
De Luxe Edition, $4.00

Robert Packard & Company
Publishers
15 East Washington St.,
Chicago, Ill.

OCTOBER

Marks the possibility of real savings in Autumn and Winter wardrobes. For through the use of this Service many previously worn garments—of men, women and children—may be recovered to further usefulness and good appearance. Fine equipment, experience and skill combine towards making our cleansing so dependable.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

RUSSIA

A new paper appearing in Russia publishes a table of the steps taken by the Soviet Union since 1919 towards peace and disarmament. The list includes 12 proposals of peace to various countries, the conclusion of five pacts of neutrality and non-aggression, the drafting of schemes for general and for partial disarmament, presented at Geneva, and the Moscow Protocol for the immediate coming into force of the Kellogg Pact.